

Private Organizations (POs) -- DAIG Concerns

Here are some DAIG concerns about the Army's relationships with private organizations. Even though the ethics and legal community works hard to ensure that our commanders, directors, supervisors, and employees know the Standards of Ethical Conduct/Joint Ethics rules, here is what REALLY is happening on a general, continuing and systemic basis throughout the Army.

1. OPDs, NCOPDs, inprocessing centers, and other official settings are used frequently to promote PO membership and products.

2. There still are cases where leaders serve as PO officers, directors and advisors because they inherited the responsibility from their predecessor in their official position (e.g., all commanders of X Brigade are appointed as President of the ABC Association, and each of the Battalion Commanders have specific jobs with the PO). As a result, they perform their new PO position as part of their official duties. (Note that JER 3-301 prohibits employees from accepting positions with a PO that are based on their official position.)

3. Related to number 2, Army personnel routinely perform PO business as part of their official duties (e.g., administer, set-up, coordinate, various PO events such as dinners, golf tournaments, bazaars, sporting events, displays, trade shows; tasked to sell souvenirs, raffle tickets, and other items) ... way beyond JER 3-211 support.

4. Related to numbers 2 & 3, some installations have full-time AUSA offices operated by active duty personnel on Government time and report to the commander and staff.

5. Co-sponsorship guidelines are not followed. Co-sponsorship is abused. More often than not, the Army gets little benefit, and the major benefit is to the PO.

6. Although DoD Liaisons to POs could describe their proper function as envisioned by JER 3-201a, too often they are performing unauthorized functions, such as active participation in PO management, running PO membership drives, assisting with fundraising events, and generally actively planning coordinating and supervising PO functions.

7. It is still a common situation where commanders establish PO membership goals, track progress and maintain membership statistics. Progress is briefed at staff meetings and during quarterly training briefs.

8. Incentives and disincentives are still commonly used to promote PO membership (primarily AUSA) and to participate in PO activities.

9. AUSA receives preferential treatment.

10. Many installations have established full-time AUSA offices to administer and promote AUSA activities, and these offices report to the commanders and staff.

Finally, it would seem that no commander, staff or DoD Liaison has ever seen the Chief of Staff pamphlet on private organizations issued in early 1995. The only ones who have them seem to be the Ethics Counselors who attended one of the Ethics Counselors Workshop at TJAGSA. While doing their study, the IGs distributed hundreds of this booklet.

I think that you will see much more on this. All the MSCs are supposed to have the DAIG report. When you review the report, you will note that there are many other issues in addition to "ethics." Many installations are not following the AR 210-1 and AR 405-80 regulations with respect to operating permits, revalidation of permits, licenses and leases.

We can expect formal taskers from HQDA. Now is the time to begin to work on the issues.

Mike Wentink